

THEODORE J. BOUTROUS JR., SBN 132099
 tboutrous@gibsondunn.com
 RICHARD J. DOREN, SBN 124666
 rdoren@gibsondunn.com
 DANIEL G. SWANSON, SBN 116556
 dswanson@gibsondunn.com partial sealing
 JAY P. SRINIVASAN, SBN 181471
 jsrinivasan@gibsondunn.com
 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 333 South Grand Avenue
 Los Angeles, CA 90071
 Telephone: 213.229.7000
 Facsimile: 213.229.7520
 VERONICA S. MOYÉ (Texas Bar No.
 24000092; *pro hac vice*)
 vmoye@gibsondunn.com
 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100
 Dallas, TX 75201
 Telephone: 214.698.3100
 Facsimile: 214.571.2900

MARK A. PERRY, SBN 212532
 mperry@gibsondunn.com
 CYNTHIA E. RICHMAN (D.C. Bar No.
 492089; *pro hac vice*)
 crichman@gibsondunn.com
 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
 Washington, DC 20036
 Telephone: 202.955.8500
 Facsimile: 202.467.0539
 ETHAN DETTMER, SBN 196046
 edettmer@gibsondunn.com
 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 555 Mission Street
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: 415.393.8200
 Facsimile: 415.393.8306
 Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 OAKLAND DIVISION

EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Plaintiff, Counter-
 defendant

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant,
 Counterclaimant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR-TSH

**DECLARATION OF RACHEL S. BRASS IN
 SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
 EXHIBIT PX-1047 AND LIVE TRIAL
 TESTIMONY RELATED THERETO**

1 I hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of California, and a member of the Bar
3 of this Court. I am a partner at the law firm Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, counsel of record for
4 Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”) in this case. I am familiar with Apple’s treatment of highly proprietary
5 and confidential information, based on my personal experience representing Apple.¹ I have personal
6 knowledge of the facts stated below and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently
7 thereto. I submit this declaration in support of Apple’s Administrative Motion to Seal Exhibit PX-
8 1047 and Live Trial Testimony Related Thereto.

9 2. When a party seeks to seal records for use at trial, there is a “strong presumption in favor
10 of access” that can be overcome only by “compelling reasons.” *Kamakana v. City & County of*
11 *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quotation marks omitted). The party seeking to seal
12 the document or proceedings must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings
13 that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” *Id.* at 1178–
14 79 (alteration, citation, and quotation marks omitted). “In general, ‘compelling reasons’ sufficient to
15 outweigh the public’s interest in disclosure and justify sealing court records exist when such ‘court
16 files might have become a vehicle for improper purposes,’ such as the use of records to gratify private
17 spite, promote public scandal, circulate libelous statements, or release trade secrets.” *Id.* at 1179
18 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)).

19 3. Apple operates in an intensely competitive marketplace. It occupies a unique position
20 as a leader with respect to a number of highly dynamic technologies. Apple has serious and legitimate
21 concerns that competitors will be quick to pounce on any release of Apple’s highly sensitive,
22 proprietary information in order to gain competitive advantage. As such, Apple takes extensive
23 measures to protect the confidentiality of its proprietary information.

24
25
26 ¹ Courts in this District routinely grant motions to seal on the basis of declarations of counsel. *See*,
27 *e.g.*, *In Re Qualcomm Litig.*, No. 17-00108, Dkt. 398-1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2018); *Avago Techs. U.S.*
28 *Inc., et al. v. Iptronics Inc., et al.*, No. 10-02863-EJD, Dkt. 544 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2015); *Cisco*
Sys., Inc., et al. v. Opentv Inc., et al., No. 13-00282-EJD, Dkt. 76 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2018). I am
personally familiar with Apple’s safeguarding of proprietary information, but if the Court deems
this declaration insufficient, Apple respectfully requests that it be permitted to file a further
declaration supporting filing under seal.

4. The Court has “broad latitude” “to prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, *but not limited to*, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (emphasis in original).

5. The Court has expressed a desire for these proceedings to be public. To that end, Apple has carefully reviewed the parties’ exhibits, including PX-1047, and now proposes only those redactions that are essential.

6. Here, Apple seeks only to seal non-public financial information that, if disclosed, would put Apple at a competitive disadvantage, and that the Court has already ordered sealed in a separate order. Specifically, Exhibit PX-1047 contains non-public financial data related to App Store apps, total Apple commissions (in specific dollar amounts), and estimated purchased volume (in specific dollar amounts), all of which has already been ordered sealed by the Court at Table 8 of the Opening Written Direct Testimony of Dr. David S. Evans.² *See* Dkt. 614 at 4 (order sealing Evans Opening Table 8 because it “contains Apple’s confidential financial information”); *see also* Dkt. 540-2 at 71 (unredacted Evans Opening Table 8 containing same, now-sealed non-public Apple financial as reflected in Exhibit PX-1047).

7. I have met and conferred in good faith with counsel for Epic, including by telephone, in an effort to narrow the documents and testimony that the parties propose to maintain under seal in this action. This process has resulted in narrowing the amount of designated confidential material.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Declaration was executed on May 23 2021 at Oakland, California.

/s/ Rachel S. Brass
Rachel S. Brass

² Although PX-1047 cites to “Table VII-7” of the Evans Opening Expert Report, that table became Table 8 in the Evans Opening Written Direct Testimony.